United Nations A/55/740–S/2001/70

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
23 January 2001

Original: English

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session
Agenda items 20 and 46
Strengthening of the coordination of humanitarian and disaster relief assistance of the United Nations, including special economic assistance

The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security

Security Council
Fifty-sixth year

Identical letters dated 23 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Afghanistan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to forward herewith the text of a letter dated 23 January 2001 from A. Abdullah, Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Islamic State of Afghanistan, addressed to you (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the text of the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Dr. Ravan **Farhâdi**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

01-22313 (E) 240101

Annex to the identical letters dated 23 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Afghanistan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council

Following the convening of the meeting in Akora Khattak, Pakistan, on 10 January 2001 of the Pakistan-based extremist groups, advocating maximized military support of Pakistan to the Taliban-Osama coalition, and defying the United Nations sanctions against the militia, the Pakistan military junta has brought in new military force in northern Afghanistan.

Reports gathered recently by the security services of the Islamic State of Afghanistan indicate that since 12 January 2001, a number of new commando and artillery units of the Pakistan Army have been deployed in northern Afghanistan, in preparation for foreseeable attacks on the government forces.

According to the reports, in a sweeping move, preceding the deadline of the imposition of the new United Nations sanctions against the Taliban mercenaries, Pakistan army officers and units have recently been posted to Afghanistan as follows:

1. General Qamar-u-Zaman of the Pakistan Army has been assigned as the new officer in charge of military operations in Afghanistan, replacing Pakistan's General of the Army Saeed Zafar, who functioned in the same capacity in Afghanistan over the past year;

2. General Tariq Bashir, formerly commander of the Ninth Commando Division of the Pakistan Army;

3. Brigadier Momin of the Kohat Division of the Pakistan Army;

4. Colonel Sanaullah of the Kohat Division of the Pakistan Army;

5. Colonel Hamza of Pakistan's military intelligence services (ISI);

6. The 998 Brigade has been replaced by the 996 Brigade of Charat Commando Divisions, under Brigadier Amjad of Sayawali, Pakistan;

7. The 117 Brigade has been replaced by the 994 Brigade, under Faizan Khan of Laki Maroot, Pakistan;

8. The 625 Artillery Battalion has been newly deployed in the northern Kunduz province, under ranking officer Rafique of the Pakistan Army;

9. Brigadier Amjad has been assigned as the commanding officer of Pakistan attacking forces in the northern Takhar province. The Pakistan Army units operating under Brigadier Amjad are reported to have been especially equipped with infrastructure capability to cross the Kokcha River, where the government forces are entrenched;

10. The 998 Brigade has been withdrawn from the fronts, and designated as the Reserve Corps, to take over the ongoing routine military training in preparation for future deployments across Afghanistan;

11. The total additional number of armed Pakistan nationals, recently dispatched to northern Afghanistan, is estimated at about 1,500.

According to the reports, Pakistan forces have joined scores of heavily armed militants from the Osama bin Laden Al-Qaeda terrorist network and a sizeable number of Taliban mercenaries, already poised to attack territories across the Kokcha River on the border of Badakhshan province in the north-east. An attack by the Pakistan-Taliban-Osama forces on 12 January, targeting Khoja-Ghar, Dasht-e-Qala and Ay Khanum along the same area was beaten back fiercely by the government troops, with as many as 200 Taliban dead and heavy material losses.

The convening of the Akora Khattak meeting in broad daylight by as many as 30 militant groups, protected by hundreds of heavily armed guards of their own, while martial law imposed by the military Government of Pakistan remains in effect throughout the country, among other things, serves as ample proof that the gathering was orchestrated by the Government of Pakistan aimed at intensifying and prolonging the war in Afghanistan and yet misleading the international community. The gathering, attended by top-ranking officers of the Pakistan ISI, such as General (retired) Hamid Gul, former Chief of military intelligence services and General Aslam Beg of the Pakistan Army, starkly unravels Pakistan's un-Islamic exploitation of religion for its unholy military and political hegemonic purposes, while bringing to light the treacherous and bogus preaching of the Pakistan political and military establishment concerning the "negative impacts of the United Nations sanctions on the civilian population of Afghanistan".

The current surge in Pakistan military involvement in Afghanistan clearly manifests Pakistan's belligerence against the Security Council resolution, that, inter alia, calls for an embargo on provision of arms and military aid to the Taliban, immediate withdrawal of foreign military personnel from Afghanistan and closure of all terrorist training camps inside Afghanistan.

(*Signed*) Dr. A. **Abdullah**
Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs of the
Islamic State of Afghanistan

United Nations A/55/742–S/2001/71

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
23 January 2001

Original: English

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session
Agenda item 164
Measures to eliminate international terrorism

Security Council
Fifty-sixth year

Letter dated 23 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I wish to draw your attention to two recent acts of Palestinian terrorism directed against Israeli civilians.

On 17 January 2000, Israeli soldiers discovered the bullet-riddled body of Ofir Rahum, a 16-year-old Israeli youth from the city of Ashkelon. This heinous and premeditated murder was conceived and implemented over an extended period of time. Several weeks prior to his murder, Rahum befriended a young Palestinian woman, Amna Mona Jawad, after corresponding with her over the Internet. Jawad posed as an American tourist in order to lure Rahum from his home in Ashkelon to Jerusalem for a meeting. Jawad then drove the innocent teenager to a pre-arranged location near El-Bireh, on the outskirts of the Palestinian-controlled town of Ramallah. Upon reaching the designated spot, Jawad exited the vehicle in which they had been travelling, another vehicle approached, and three members of the Tanzim paramilitary group shot Rahum more than 15 times, mutilating his body beyond recognition. Rahum's body was then dumped in another location where it was subsequently found.

This cruel and cold-blooded murder of a blameless 16-year-old boy by Palestinian gunmen comes just days after the murder of another Israeli civilian, Ronni Tsalah, who was killed by terrorists near his home in Kfar Yam. Soldiers of the Israel Defence Forces discovered Tsalah's body on 15 January after having been informed by his family of his abduction. The remains of Tsalah's car, which had been burned and wrecked by a Palestinian mob, were later found in the Palestinian-controlled town of Khan Yunis.

It must be stressed that, as Israel works to maintain security cooperation with the Palestinian Authority and to contain violence directed against Israeli soldiers and civilians, terror attacks and other violent provocations continue. The murders of Ofir Rahum and Ronni Tsalah come amid a continuing wave of Palestinian violence and terrorism which I have detailed in a number of letters, most recently of 28 December 2000 (A/55/719-S/2000/1252), 22 November 2000 (A/55/641-S/2000/1114) and 20 November 2000 (A/55/634-S/2000/1108).

01-22410 (E) 230101

As these letters have shown, many terrorist attacks have been carried out by members of the Tanzim, the paramilitary wing of Chairman Arafat's own Fatah faction. Despite signed agreements reached with Israel, the Palestinian leadership has failed to disarm the Tanzim, members of which carried out the reprehensible attack of 20 November 2000 on a bus-load of Israeli schoolchildren. The freedom of action that the Tanzim and other terrorist groups enjoy in the territories under control of the Palestinian Authority has directly led to the violence and terrorism we are now experiencing.

Moreover, these murders illustrate, yet again, that the current unrest is hardly a popular civilian uprising, but rather a calculated campaign waged not only by civilians, but by violent terrorist cells and armed militias, inspired by the Palestinian leadership and encouraged by their official media outlets.

Israel reiterates its call upon the Palestinian Authority to abide by its commitments to put an end to terrorist activity and other forms of violence emanating from the territory under its control.

I should be grateful if you would arrange to have the text of the present letter circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 164, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Yehuda **Lancry**
Permanent Representative

United Nations S/2001/72

Security Council

Distr.: General
23 January 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 23 January 2001 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to transmit herewith, for the attention of the members of the Security Council, a report of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, pursuant to paragraph 6, subparagraph (f), of the guidelines to facilitate full international implementation of paragraphs 24, 25 and 27 of Council resolution 687 (1991) (see annex).

The report was approved by the Committee on 23 January 2001.

(*Signed*) Ole Peter **Kolby**
Chairman
Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990)
concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait

01-22404 (E) 230101

Annex

Report of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait pursuant to paragraph 6, subparagraph (f), of the guidelines to facilitate full international implementation of paragraphs 24, 25 and 27 of Security Council resolution 687 (1991)

1. The present report is submitted by the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, in accordance with paragraph 6, subparagraph (f), of the guidelines for facilitating full international implementation of paragraphs 24, 25 and 27 of Council resolution 687 (1991), of 3 April 1991 approved by Council resolution 700 (1991) of 17 June 1991 (S/22660, annex).

2. Under paragraph 6, subparagraph (f), of the guidelines, the Committee is required to report at 90-day intervals to the Security Council on the implementation of the arms and related sanctions against Iraq contained in the relevant resolutions of the Council. The present report is the thirty-ninth of its kind submitted under the above-mentioned guidelines.

3. By paragraph 12 of the guidelines, all States are requested to report to the Committee any information that may have come to their attention relating to possible violations by other States or foreign nationals of the arms and related sanctions against Iraq. During the period under review, no information as requested by paragraph 12 has been brought to the attention of the Committee.

4. By paragraphs 13 and 15 of the guidelines, all States and international organizations are required to consult the Committee on the question of whether certain items fall within the provisions of paragraph 24 of resolution 687 (1991), as well as in cases relating to dual-use or multiple-use items which are meant for civilian use but with potential for diversion or conversion to military use. During the period of this report, the Committee has not been consulted by any State or international organization on these questions.

5. By paragraph 14 of the guidelines, international organizations are requested to take all appropriate steps to assist in ensuring full compliance with the arms and related sanctions against Iraq, including providing to the Committee any information of this kind that may come to their attention. During the period covered by this report, no information as requested by paragraph 14 of the guidelines has been brought to the attention of the Committee.

6. The Committee will continue its efforts to fulfil the mandate entrusted to it by the Security Council.

United Nations S/2001/73

Security Council

Distr.: General
23 January 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 23 January 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

Further to the address made by Ambassador Paul Heinbecker to the Security Council on 16 January 2001, I am pleased to provide herewith Canada's proposal for improving cooperation between the Council and troop-contributing countries (see annex). I would be grateful if the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the Council.

(*Signed*) Michel **Duval**
Ambassador
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

01-22435 (E) 230101

Annex to the letter dated 23 January 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

A mission-specific cooperative mechanism for Security Council-mandated operations

Problematic

1. The issue is not communications and consultations, however imperfect they have been in practice, but cooperation and participation. Missions have become progressively more complex and dangerous. Politically responsible Governments cannot provide troops to such contemporary missions unless they are confident that these missions are sound and that their soldiers are secure, at least within the parameters of what are inherently risky enterprises. Confidence comes from participation in the decision-making process, from inception through deployment to termination. Responsible and effective decisions require that risk be integrated with authority. It is not beyond the ingenuity of members of the United Nations to reconcile the Security Council's "constitutionally mandated" primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security with the troop-contributing countries' political necessity of participating in decisions to that end. We have not yet found a way for troop contributors to participate in the decision-making process. This non-paper suggests how it might be done.

Proposal

2. For each mission, an **operation-specific cooperative committee** would be established by the Security Council with troop-contributing countries. This committee would involve a partnership of trust and collaboration between the Council and the troop contributors, supported by the Secretariat. Participation of troop-contributing countries (TCCs) in the Committee would involve those countries contributing formed military units and/or senior command personnel, when they are not the same.

Military advice

3. In every phase, it will be important that the committee (and the Security Council) receive sound military advice from the Military Adviser to the Secretary-General and the Force Commander. They should be able to answer the key questions whether the plan is militarily sound and if the forces proposed for the operation are sufficient. Conceivably, the military staff committee should be revived and bolstered by the participation of troop-contributing countries.

Decision-making

4. The new mechanism would recognize the Security Council's primary, but not exclusive, responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. The new mechanism would not supplant this responsibility but rather would complement it. The **operation-specific cooperative committee**, nonetheless, would be a decision-making committee and would entail troop contributors participating in the pre-decision-making of the Council. The Council would retain its ultimate decision-making authority, but, as a practical matter, would not make decisions that did not carry the formal consensus of the troop contributors. Troop contributors that could not rally to an emerging consensus would withdraw.

5. This approach is, to a significant degree, an extension of the concept of the Integrated Mission Task Force (IMTF) advocated in the Brahimi report (A/55/305-S/2000/809). It is also consistent with the Brahimi recommendation to establish ad hoc subsidiary organs of the Security Council (paras. 61 and 64 (d)).

6. The modalities for such an **operation-specific cooperative committee** would be very simple. It would be presided over by a Security Council member with a natural lead interest in the situation. All other Council members and those TCCs meeting participation criteria would be full members. Decisions would normally be made by consensus. The Secretariat would actively support the committee; participation by the relevant United Nations agencies would be essential. The parties to the conflict would be excluded. Modalities for consultations with the parties to the conflict would be developed on a case-by-case basis.

23 January 2001

United Nations S/2001/74

Security Council

Distr.: General
23 January 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 23 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of the Gambia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

Upon the instructions of my Government, in pursuance of my letter dated 28 December 2000 to you (S/2001/8), I have the honour to state as follows:

While continuing to refute categorically any official involvement in the illegal trade of Sierra Leone diamonds, the Government of the Gambia has never denied that some individuals have been involved in this trade long before the Gambia became independent. This is common knowledge. A clear distinction must therefore be made between the actions of individuals and those of a Government. Individuals should be accountable for their actions. A Government should not be taken to task to account for the actions of an individual or group of individuals, especially in a case like this.

Secondly, the Government of the Gambia still cannot understand why the members of the Panel of Experts on Sierra Leone Diamonds and Arms visited all the countries mentioned in their report except the Gambia. Is there a hidden agenda? What is the motive behind those baseless and malicious allegations? Why this smear campaign against a country that has done so much for Sierra Leone, a sister country, and continues to play its part, modestly but sincerely, through concerted international effort, to bring a lasting peace to that country? The Government and people of the Gambia expect answers to these questions in order to set the record straight and redress the situation. The Government of the Gambia will defend its integrity at all costs. In this regard, it is inviting the Panel to present any evidence on these allegations. If the Panel fails to do so, then the Gambia should be removed from the list of countries trading in conflict diamonds. The Government of the Gambia is therefore giving the Panel two weeks to respond, failing which it would be compelled to take any appropriate action necessary to clear its name and restore the country's image as a respectable and peace-loving member of the international community.

Thirdly, it is amazing to note that helpless developing countries always bear the brunt of sanctions and the threat of sanctions but not the developed countries that buy these diamonds and then sell them for profit. This is a clear practice of double standards, bordering on outright discrimination against developing countries, especially African countries. The Gambian authorities would like to know why. Is it because they are developed countries? Is it because they are European countries? It is the view of the Government of the Gambia that the countries that are the final

01-22441 (E) 230101

destination of these conflict/blood diamonds, that is to say, those countries in the developed world where they are sold, should also be sanctioned and not transit countries alone.

In light of the foregoing, therefore, the Government of the Gambia is reiterating its request for the Security Council to suspend its consideration of the report (S/2000/1195, annex, enclosure) until a delegation of the Panel visits the Gambia, in all fairness, guided by the principle of equal treatment of all Member States. The Council is expected to address our concerns without fear or favour.

Furthermore, in the case of the Gambia there is no evidence whatsoever establishing any links between the sale of such diamonds and gun-running activities in Sierra Leone. Besides, the Gambia has no borders with Sierra Leone.

I should therefore be most grateful if the present letter could be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Baboucarr-Blaise Ismaila **Jagne**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

United Nations S/2001/75

Security Council

Distr.: General
24 January 2001
English
Original: Arabic

Letter dated 23 January 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a letter dated 23 January 2001 from Mr. Mohammed Said Al-Sahaf, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq, concerning the discussions which were held in the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) on 8 and 18 January 2001, the interventions of the United States and United Kingdom representatives and their attempts to adduce unfounded arguments and obstruct Iraq's request to allocate 1 billion euros to supplying the urgent humanitarian needs of the Palestinian people, which demonstrated the double standards, arrogance and blatant hypocrisy of the United States representative.

The Minister urges you, yet again, to exert every effort to ensure that the members of the Committee authorize Iraq's request with all possible speed.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Mohammed **Al-Humaimidi**
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

01-22566 (E) 260101 260101

Annex to the letter dated 23 January 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I am sure that you are aware of the discussions which were held in the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) on 8 and 18 January 2001 under the chairmanship of the representative of Norway to the United Nations, Ambassador Peter Kolby, concerning Iraq's decision to allocate 1 billion euros to the Palestinian people, as I have informed you in my letters, the most recent being the letter dated 19 December 2000 (S/2000/1217, annex).

I am also sure that you are aware of the interventions of the United States and United Kingdom representatives and their attempts to adduce unfounded arguments and obstruct Iraq's request to allocate 1 billion euros of its assets to supplying the urgent humanitarian needs of the fraternal Palestinian people.

The Palestinian people, which is suffering under the most repugnant form of abominable, racist colonial rule, represented by the Zionist entity that is occupying the Palestinian territories, is in the most urgent need of genuine and prompt humanitarian assistance. Iraq's wish to support and relieve the families of the martyrs and wounded of the intifada, help the owners of the houses and properties damaged by the Zionist aggression and provide the embattled Palestinian people with food, medicine and basic requirements on a basis of equality with the fraternal Iraqi people, is not prompted by any narrow concept of assistance, which is normally based on self-interest, but by its membership of the Arab nation, which unites the people of Iraq with the fraternal people of Palestine.

The discussions which were held in the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) on 8 and 18 January 2001 clearly exposed the irrationality of the proposals put forward by the United States representative and made clear the degree of malice felt by the United States Administration towards the Arabs. The United States and United Kingdom officials are not the legal guardians of the Iraqi people and assets: the Iraqi people has sole right to dispose of its assets. In the letter dated 26 November which I addressed to you (S/2000/1119, annex), I explained the circumstances surrounding the Iraqi request to allocate a portion of its oil revenues to supply the urgent humanitarian needs of the Palestinian Arab people.

The double standards, arrogance and blatant hypocrisy of the United States representative mean that he does not see the extent to which Iraqi assets are being squandered as a result of the transfer of more than US$ 11 billion of the Iraqi people's money to the so-called Compensation Fund. More than US$ 1 billion has been spent on the operational expenses of the Office of the Iraq Programme and the so-called Compensation Commission, mostly in paying the inflated salaries of its employees, the cost of their first-class air travel and in buying cars and furniture for their grandiose offices. The United States representative, who is deeply mired in a policy of double standards, does not seek to prevent these vast sums being deducted from the Iraqi people's assets and frittered away. On the contrary, he supports that waste, which is in fact the theft of Iraqi property. However, when Iraq wishes to support its brother Palestinians and share its own basic sustenance with them, the United States representative is vehemently opposed and weeps crocodile tears over Iraq's financial assets. In his sickening political hypocrisy he is oblivious to the fact that the most basic rules of justice and impartiality are required for humanitarian

assistance, in particular when a people is subjected to the most offensive forms of occupation, killing, maltreatment and siege, as is the Palestinian people.

Furthermore, the United States representative makes no reference to his own obduracy or that of the United Kingdom representative on the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) and the fact that they have placed on hold 1,762 contracts, for sectors including health, electricity, agriculture, water, sanitation, education, irrigation, oil and communications, under the various phases of the memorandum of understanding. In this immoral manner, and for reasons that are concealed from no one, they have prevented the most basic humanitarian necessities from reaching the Iraqi people.

The continuing and worsening suffering of the Palestinian Arab people in the occupied territories caused by the daily Zionist aggression makes it incumbent upon all just and honourable people throughout the world to take a principled stand against the suffering of this embattled people and against the attempts of the United States and the United Kingdom to prevent food and medicine reaching this steadfast people as it faces the most loathsome butchery, maltreatment and destruction at the hands of gangs of Zionist murderers.

In view of the foregoing, and in order to expedite the dispatch of food, medicine and basic humanitarian needs to the Palestinian Arab people, I reiterate yet again the request of my Government that you should exert every effort to ensure that the members of the Committee authorize Iraq's request with all possible speed.

(*Signed*) Mohammed Said **Al-Sahaf**
Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq

United Nations S/2001/76

Security Council

Distr.: General
24 January 2001
English
Original: Arabic

Letter dated 23 January 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a letter dated 23 January 2001 from Mr. Mohammed Said Al-Sahaf, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq, concerning the discussions which were held in the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) on 8 and 18 January 2001, the interventions of the United States and United Kingdom representatives and their attempts to adduce unfounded arguments and obstruct Iraq's request to allocate 1 billion euros to supplying the urgent humanitarian needs of the Palestinian people, which demonstrated the double standards, arrogance and blatant hypocrisy of the United States representative.

The Minister urges you, yet again, to exert every effort to ensure that the members of the Committee authorize Iraq's request with all possible speed.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Mohammed **Al-Humaimidi**
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

01-22614 (E) 260101 260101

Annex to the letter dated 23 January 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

I am sure that you are aware of the discussions which were held in the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) on 8 and 18 January 2001 under the chairmanship of the representative of Norway to the United Nations, Ambassador Peter Kolby, concerning Iraq's decision to allocate 1 billion euros to the Palestinian people, as I have informed you in my letters, the most recent being the letter dated 19 December 2000 (S/2000/1217, annex).

I am also sure that you are aware of the interventions of the United States and United Kingdom representatives and their attempts to adduce unfounded arguments and obstruct Iraq's request to allocate 1 billion euros of its assets to supplying the urgent humanitarian needs of the fraternal Palestinian people.

The Palestinian people, which is suffering under the most repugnant form of abominable, racist colonial rule, represented by the Zionist entity that is occupying the Palestinian territories, is in the most urgent need of genuine and prompt humanitarian assistance. Iraq's wish to support and relieve the families of the martyrs and wounded of the intifada, help the owners of the houses and properties damaged by the Zionist aggression and provide the embattled Palestinian people with food, medicine and basic requirements on a basis of equality with the fraternal Iraqi people, is not prompted by any narrow concept of assistance, which is normally based on self-interest, but by its membership of the Arab nation, which unites the people of Iraq with the fraternal people of Palestine.

The discussions which were held in the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) on 8 and 18 January 2001 clearly exposed the irrationality of the proposals put forward by the United States representative and made clear the degree of malice felt by the United States Administration towards the Arabs. The United States and United Kingdom officials are not the legal guardians of the Iraqi people and assets: the Iraqi people has sole right to dispose of its assets. In the letter dated 26 November which I addressed to you (S/2000/1119, annex), I explained the circumstances surrounding the Iraqi request to allocate a portion of its oil revenues to supply the urgent humanitarian needs of the Palestinian Arab people.

The double standards, arrogance and blatant hypocrisy of the United States representative mean that he does not see the extent to which Iraqi assets are being squandered as a result of the transfer of more than US$ 11 billion of the Iraqi people's money to the so-called Compensation Fund. More than US$ 1 billion has been spent on the operational expenses of the Office of the Iraq Programme and the so-called Compensation Commission, mostly in paying the inflated salaries of its employees, the cost of their first-class air travel and in buying cars and furniture for their grandiose offices. The United States representative, who is deeply mired in a policy of double standards, does not seek to prevent these vast sums being deducted from the Iraqi people's assets and frittered away. On the contrary, he supports that waste, which is in fact the theft of Iraqi property. However, when Iraq wishes to support its brother Palestinians and share its own basic sustenance with them, the United States representative is vehemently opposed and weeps crocodile tears over Iraq's financial assets. In his sickening political hypocrisy he is oblivious to the fact that the most basic rules of justice and impartiality are required for humanitarian

assistance, in particular when a people is subjected to the most offensive forms of occupation, killing, maltreatment and siege, as is the Palestinian people.

Furthermore, the United States representative makes no reference to his own obduracy or that of the United Kingdom representative on the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) and the fact that they have placed on hold 1,762 contracts, for sectors including health, electricity, agriculture, water, sanitation, education, irrigation, oil and communications, under the various phases of the memorandum of understanding. In this immoral manner, and for reasons that are concealed from no one, they have prevented the most basic humanitarian necessities from reaching the Iraqi people.

The continuing and worsening suffering of the Palestinian Arab people in the occupied territories caused by the daily Zionist aggression makes it incumbent upon all just and honourable people throughout the world to take a principled stand against the suffering of this embattled people and against the attempts of the United States and the United Kingdom to prevent food and medicine reaching this steadfast people as it faces the most loathsome butchery, maltreatment and destruction at the hands of gangs of Zionist murderers.

In view of the foregoing, and in order to expedite the dispatch of food, medicine and basic humanitarian needs to the Palestinian Arab people, I reiterate yet again the request of my Government that you should exert every effort to ensure that the members of the Committee authorize Iraq's request with all possible speed.

(*Signed*) Mohammed Said **Al-Sahaf**
Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq

United Nations S/2001/77

Security Council

Distr.: General
24 January 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 12 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Zambia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

On instruction from my Government, I wish to refer to the letter dated 28 December 2000 addressed to you by the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to the United Nations, in which it was alleged that the Zambian Government granted use of its territory by the Rwandan Patriotic Army and armed members of the União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola (UNITA) to launch attacks on Katanga Province of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The said letter, among other things, expressed "deep concern at the unfriendly attitude of the Zambian authorities". My Government had hoped that the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo would, based on verifiable facts, have the courage to retract the allegations. This has not been done.

The Government of the Republic of Zambia wishes to inform the Security Council that:

(a) Zambia has been and will continue to remain neutral with regard to the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

(b) Zambia respects and will continue to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all its neighbours, including the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

(c) Zambia maintains warm and cordial relations with the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It is in this context that when information first surfaced alleging use of Zambian territory by the Rwandese army and armed UNITA elements, the Congolese Government dispatched a Special Envoy to Zambia on 28 December 2000, to discuss the matter. At the suggestion and with the facilitation of the Zambian Government, the Congolese Special Envoy and his delegation visited the area concerned in the northern part of Zambia to, among other things, verify the allegations;

(d) On 4 January 2001, the Presidents of Zambia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo held a meeting in Ndola, Zambia, during which the allegations were discussed, among other issues of common interest to both countries. The two Presidents concluded that there was no truth to the allegations, and the late President Laurent Desiré Kabila assured his Zambian counterpart that the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo would formally apologize

01-22560 (E) 240101

to the Security Council and withdraw the letter which was circulated by the Chargé d'affaires;

(e) It is in the context of these relations that Zambia has been receiving and looking after refugees from the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In addition, Zambia has, from time to time, received armed personnel from various parties displaced by the war in the Congo, including Congolese soldiers. Zambia makes evry effort to repatriate these forces to their countries of origin, except for those who voluntarily renounce their military status and freely choose not to go back to their countries. As the Security Council may be aware, the most recent repatriation of combatants from Zambia involved about 3,000 Congolese soldiers over the New Year weekend.

My Government feels compelled to issue this letter because the letter dated 10 January 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires of the Permanent Mission of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/29) does not, in our view, amount to the unconditional withdrawal of his letter of 28 December 2000, which President Kabila had promised would be done. Furthermore, my Government wishes to inform the Security Council that the said letter does not correctly reflect the spirit, tone, and content of what was discussed by the Heads of State of Zambia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo at their recent meeting in Ndola.

I would be most grateful if you could circulate this letter as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Prof. Mwelwa C. **Musambachime**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

United Nations S/2001/77*

Security Council

Distr.: General
24 January 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 12 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Zambia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

On instruction from my Government, I wish to refer to the letter dated 28 December 2000 addressed to you by the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to the United Nations, in which it was alleged that the Zambian Government granted use of its territory by the Rwandan Patriotic Army and armed members of the União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola (UNITA) to launch attacks on Katanga Province of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The said letter, among other things, expressed "deep concern at the unfriendly attitude of the Zambian authorities". My Government had hoped that the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo would, based on verifiable facts, have the courage to retract the allegations. This has not been done.

The Government of the Republic of Zambia wishes to inform the Security Council that:

(a) Zambia has been and will continue to remain neutral with regard to the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

(b) Zambia respects and will continue to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all its neighbours, including the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

(c) Zambia maintains warm and cordial relations with the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It is in this context that when information first surfaced alleging use of Zambian territory by the Rwandese army and armed UNITA elements, the Congolese Government dispatched a Special Envoy to Zambia on 28 December 2000, to discuss the matter. At the suggestion and with the facilitation of the Zambian Government, the Congolese Special Envoy and his delegation visited the area concerned in the northern part of Zambia to, among other things, verify the allegations;

(d) On 4 January 2001, the Presidents of Zambia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo held a meeting in Ndola, Zambia, during which the allegations were discussed, among other issues of common interest to both countries. The two Presidents concluded that there was no truth to the allegations,

* Reissued for technical reasons.

01-22560* (E) 250101

and President Laurent Desiré Kabila assured his Zambian counterpart that the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo would formally apologize to the Security Council and withdraw the letter which was circulated by the Chargé d'affaires;

(e) It is in the context of these relations that Zambia has been receiving and looking after refugees from the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In addition, Zambia has, from time to time, received armed personnel from various parties displaced by the war in the Congo, including Congolese soldiers. Zambia makes every effort to repatriate these forces to their countries of origin, except for those who voluntarily renounce their military status and freely choose not to go back to their countries. As the Security Council may be aware, the most recent repatriation of combatants from Zambia involved about 3,000 Congolese soldiers over the New Year weekend.

My Government feels compelled to issue this letter because the letter dated 10 January 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires of the Permanent Mission of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/29) does not, in our view, amount to the unconditional withdrawal of his letter of 28 December 2000, which President Kabila had promised would be done. Furthermore, my Government wishes to inform the Security Council that the said letter does not correctly reflect the spirit, tone, and content of what was discussed by the Heads of State of Zambia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo at their recent meeting in Ndola.

I would be most grateful if you could circulate this letter as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Prof. Mwelwa C. **Musambachime**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

United Nations S/2001/78

Security Council

Distr.: General
24 January 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 24 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Liberia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to forward herewith a self-explanatory letter addressed to you by His Excellency Dr. Charles Ghankay Taylor, President of the Republic of Liberia (see annex).

I would be grateful if this letter and its annex were circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Neh **Dukuly-Tolbert**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

01-22608 (E) 240101

Annex to the letter dated 24 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Liberia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to present my compliments, and on behalf of the Government of Liberia, refer to the allegations as contained in the Report of the Panel of Experts appointed pursuant to Security Council resolution 1306 (2000), paragraph 19 in relation to Sierra Leone (S/2000/1195). The report alleges that I and my Government are engaged in and profiting from the sale of illicit diamonds from the Republic of Sierra Leone in exchange for the supply of arms and related war materiel to the Revolutionary United Front (RUF). According to the report, amounts received from these sales have been in excess of US$ 200 million annually for the last few years.

These allegations are grave, especially as they are directed against both the President and the Republic of Liberia, a respected member of the international community. Liberia is a founding member of both the League of Nations and the United Nations, the successor body to the League of Nations. My country is also a founding member of continental and regional organizations, including the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the Mano River Union and the Non-Aligned Movement.

But most significantly, Liberia, the oldest independent African Republic, has remained in the vanguard of the liberation and independence of the African continent, and has maintained an active posture of resistance to acts of injustice, oppression and tyranny, not only in Africa but the rest of the world. This historical struggle impelled Liberia to institute legal proceedings against the apartheid regime of South Africa, at the International Court of Justice in The Hague. This is a proud legacy that I, the twenty-first President of the Republic, will never besmear.

In December of 1989, cognizant of this legacy, I, along with other compatriots, launched a civil insurrection to overthrow a military regime which had earlier dethroned the constituted Government and orchestrated the retardation of our nation. This action was one designed and executed when it was obvious that the junta was determined to maintain their hold on power against the wishes of the majority of the population.

This movement, which commenced with less than 100 civilians, galvanized momentum and eventually engulfed the entire country and gained the support of the people.

The discipline and commitment with which we led the national revolt ultimately ensured our success at the national plebiscite in July 1997. Although Liberia's civil strife obtained over a period of seven years and assumed broader dimensions than we imagined, our leadership of the movement was firmly opposed to any act of mayhem, maiming, rape and amputation. Along similar lines, the Government of Liberia is, therefore, opposed to and condemns all acts of mayhem perpetrated by RUF or any other belligerent group in the Sierra Leonean conflict. It is the view of the Government of Liberia that those individuals engaged in such inhumane acts be brought to justice.

This Government has never denied our knowledge of RUF. However, we have always rejected and continue to reject any claims that this contact is commercial or

economic in nature. Quite to the contrary, our relationship with RUF and our corresponding security concerns have been both publicly and privately expressed to the British and the United States Governments, the United Nations and ECOWAS. Our contact with RUF is an expected response to successive Sierra Leonean Governments' active support and arming of Liberian dissident groups resident in Sierra Leone. Indeed, at the time of writing armed Liberian dissidents are members of the official Sierra Leone Army and constitute almost 50 per cent of the Kamajors — a pro-Sierra Leone Government militia headed by Mr. Hinga Norman, Sierra Leone's Deputy Minister of Defense. These dissidents have stated and demonstrated that their objective is to overthrow the Liberian Government by force of arms.

Since 1998, Liberia has sustained four massive attacks from these same insurgents, now from the Guinean side, in collaboration with the Guinean Government. The loss of lives, displacement of the population and destruction of the entire northern region of Liberia have occurred without any condemnation from the international community. At the same time, an arms embargo, originally imposed by the Security Council in 1992 at ECOWAS' behest, is still in existence, although in 1997, with the inauguration of the democratically elected Government in Liberia, ECOWAS lifted the arms embargo and despite ECOWAS' recommendation to do so, the United Nations has refused. It is important to emphasize that the initial attack from Guinea occurred immediately after we complied with the international community demands and under United Nations supervision destroyed all the arms and ammunition left over from our civil war.

Mr. Secretary-General, the well known historical fact is that Liberia has always been a commercial point for Guinean, Sierra Leonean and Liberian diamonds, attracted by the fact that the United States dollar is legal tender in Liberia. This trade has never been government-controlled, sponsored or organized; it is carried out by Lebanese, Indians, tourists, Mandingoes, Julas and Fulas — ethnic groups with family links in Guinea, Mali, Liberia, Sierra Leone, the Gambia and Côte d'Ivoire, who interact without regard to colonially established national boundaries. Liberia is, indeed, also a victim of this illicit trade and derives absolutely no benefit from same.

As earlier stated, the report claims the value of the trade by Liberia of illicit Sierra Leone diamonds to be in excess of US$ 200 million annually for the past few years. Clearly, the movement of such large amounts of money over a period of time would necessarily leave a trail because transactions would involve either cash, checks or bank transfers. Each of these would have to be documented, in the tradition of the venerated and reputable European banking system. It is reasonable to assume that if indeed I was or am involved in the sale of any diamonds for that matter, the money trail would inevitably lead to me.

Consequently, I request that the Security Council establish a blue ribbon panel to investigate and determine my ownership, if any, of any large personal funds, as a result of the diamond trade, in banks of any Member State, up to the time of publication of the report of the Panel of Experts, and by this declaration I waive all rights of non-disclosure to all banking institutions. In the event that it is determined that I own large personal funds in any foreign accounts, the information should be made public and the funds confiscated and transferred to the Liberian people. I have informed the Liberian National Legislature and the People of Liberia that, in the

event that this is found to be true, I shall resign my position as President of the Republic of Liberia.

However and correspondingly, I would expect and assume that having provided the Security Council this unique and unprecedented authorization, the Council will utilize this opportunity and expeditiously confirm the allegations of the Panel of Experts or publicly exonerate me and the Government of Liberia.

I request that you circulate this letter to members of the Security Council as a document of the Council.

(*Signed*) Dahkpannah Dr. Charles G. **Taylor**

United Nations S/2001/79

Security Council

Distr.: General
24 January 2001
English
Original: Arabic

Identical letters dated 23 January 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a letter dated 21 January 2001 from Mr. Mohammed Said Al-Sahaf, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq. The Minister calls attention to the ongoing wanton aggression against Iraq by United States and British aircraft in the unlawful no-flight zones and to the fact that in the period from 8 to 16 January 2001 they carried out 185 sorties, 64 of them from Saudi Arabia, 73 from Kuwait and 48 from Turkey.

The Minister reaffirms the Government of Iraq's condemnation of these acts of aggression against Iraqi territory, and he states that international responsibility for them must be borne by the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the countries that provide the logistic support for this aggression, namely Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Turkey. He urges you to perform the duties assigned to you under the Charter by halting this unwarranted aggression and ensuring that it does not recur.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Mohammed **Al-Humaimidi**
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

01-22626 (E) 250101 260101

Annex to the identical letters dated 23 January 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council

I should like to inform you that United States and British warplanes based in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Turkey have continued to violate the airspace of the Republic of Iraq. They carried out 185 sorties in the period from 8 to 16 January 2001, 64 of them from Saudi Arabia, 73 from Kuwait and 48 from Turkey, as shown hereunder.

1. In the northern region 48 sorties were flown at speeds of 720 to 780 kilometres per hour and at altitudes of 6,000 to 12,000 metres, as follows:

(a) At 1105 hours on 8 January 2001, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Turkish territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the northern region. They carried out 18 missions from Turkish territory, were supported by an AWACS aircraft operating inside Turkish airspace and overflew the Amadiyah, Dohuk, Aqrah, Mosul, Sinjar, Tall Afar and Irbil areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1405 hours, drove them off.

(b) At 1115 hours on 9 January 2001, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Turkish territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the northern region. They carried out 14 missions from Turkish territory, were supported by an AWACS aircraft operating inside Turkish airspace and overflew the Mosul, Irbil, Dohuk, Tall Afar, Zakho and Amadiyah areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1406 hours, drove them off.

(c) At 1015 hours on 16 January 2001, United States and British F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Turkish territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the northern region. They carried out 16 missions from Turkish territory, were supported by an AWACS aircraft operating inside Turkish airspace and overflew the Mosul, Irbil, Dohuk, Tall Afar, Zakho, Amadiyah, Baibo, Ayn Zalah and Rawanduz areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1350 hours, drove them off.

2. In the southern region 137 sorties were flown at speeds of 720 to 780 kilometres per hour and at altitudes of 9,000 to 13,000 metres, as follows:

(a) At 0825 hours on 8 January 2001, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, F-18, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Saudi and Kuwaiti territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 20 missions, 10 of them from Saudi territory with the support of an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Saudi airspace and 10 from Kuwaiti territory with the support of an E-2C command and control aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace. They overflew the Nasiriyah, Samawah, Salman, Basrah, Amarah, Ashbajah, Hayy, Hashimiyah, Jalibah, Lasaf, Najaf, Qal'at Sukkar and Shinafiyah areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 0945 hours, drove them off.

(b) At 1100 hours on 9 January 2001, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, F-18, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Saudi and Kuwaiti territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 28 missions, 18 of them from Saudi territory with the support of an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Saudi airspace and 10 from Kuwaiti territory with the support of an E-2C command and control aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace. They overflew the Nasiriyah, Samawah, Salman, Basrah, Najaf, Hayy, Diwaniyah and Lasaf areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1425 hours, drove them off.

(c) At 2018 hours on 12 January 2001, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-18, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Kuwaiti territory and supported by a Kuwaiti E-2C aircraft penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They overflew the Kut, Nasiriyah, Nu'maniyah, Shatrah, Qal'at Salih, Jalibah and Artawi areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 2135 hours, drove them off.

(d) At 1350 hours on 13 January 2001, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Saudi and Kuwaiti territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 14 missions, 10 of them from Saudi territory with the support of an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Saudi airspace and four from Kuwaiti territory with the support of an E-2C command and control aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace. They overflew the Basrah, Nasiriyah, Samawah, Salman, Najaf, Diwaniyah, Amarah, Hashimiyah, Hayy and Lasaf areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1450 hours, drove them off.

(e) At 1358 hours on 14 January 2001, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Saudi and Kuwaiti territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 14 missions, eight of them from Saudi territory with the support of an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Saudi airspace and six from Kuwaiti territory with the support of an E-2C command and control aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace. They overflew the Basrah, Nasiriyah, Amarah, Samawah, Najaf, Karbala', Lasaf, Ashbajah and Qal'at Salih areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1410 hours, drove them off.

(f) At 1200 hours on 16 January 2001, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, F-18, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Saudi and Kuwaiti territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 32 missions, 18 of them from Saudi territory with the support of an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Saudi airspace and 14 from Kuwaiti territory with the support of an E-2C command and control aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace. They overflew the Basrah, Artawi, Jalibah, Jabayish, Afak, Ashbajah, Lasaf, Nukhayb, Shatrah, Salman, Samawah, Diwaniyah, Nasiriyah, Shinafiyah, Walid (H-3) and Ukhaydir West areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1525 hours, drove them off.

This aggression illustrates the bellicose attitude being maintained by the United States of America and the United Kingdom towards Iraq. Since 1992, it has become a fixed policy aimed at undermining the country's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity and at the systematic and concerted destruction of Iraqi lives, infrastructure and civilian installations. It is a policy that

has been affirmed in successive statements made by United States and British officials seeking to defend the measures being taken to enforce the no-flight zones.

The Government of Iraq categorically rejects the two so-called no-flight zones, which were imposed by unilateral decision of the United States of America and the United Kingdom and lack any legal basis. Iraq rejects all the consequences of this illegal decision and, in particular, the flimsy excuses and pretexts used by these States in an attempt to justify their military aggression against our country.

The logistic support provided by Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Turkey to the Americans and the British has made these countries key partners in the aggression being committed against Iraq, so that they bear full international responsibility under international law. This includes liability for full compensation for the loss and damage, in both human and material terms, that is caused by these illegal practices.

The Government of Iraq further renews its call to the countries participating in this aggression to desist forthwith from internationally prohibited acts that violate Iraq's sovereignty, place its security and integrity in grave danger and pose a direct and serious threat to international peace and security.

As it condemns these acts of aggression against civilian targets and Iraqi civilian installations, the Government of Iraq urges you to perform the duties assigned to you under the Charter as they relate to the maintenance of international peace and security by intervening with the governments of the countries in question with a view to inducing them to halt, end and desist from any resumption of their constant and unwarranted aggression against an independent, sovereign State.

(*Signed*) Mohammed Said **Al-Sahaf**
Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq

United Nations S/2001/80

Security Council

Distr.: General
24 January 2001
English
Original: Arabic

Identical letters dated 23 January 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council

On instructions from my Government, I wish to transmit to you herewith a letter dated 23 January 2001 from Mr. Mohammed Said Al-Sahaf, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq, confirming Iraq's request for the allocation of 100 million euros from its funds to assist poor United States citizens, the vast majority of whom live below the poverty line, obtain their daily sustenance from refuse and garbage bags and live out in the open air, at best in cardboard boxes.

In his letter, the Minister for Foreign Affairs requests you and the Security Council to make every effort to have the Iraqi initiative approved.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Mohammed **Al-Humaimidi**
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

01-22620 (E) 250101 260101

Annex to the identical letters dated 23 January 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council

I wish to refer to my letter dated 16 January 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations (S/2001/54), in which I officially informed him of the decision taken by the Government of the Republic of Iraq, on purely humanitarian grounds, to allocate 100 million euros from the Iraqi funds in the Iraq account at the United Nations to assist poor United States citizens, the vast majority of whom live below the poverty line, obtain their daily sustenance from refuse and garbage bags and live out in the open air, at best in cardboard boxes. No just person of conscience can fail to feel sympathy for the suffering of these wretched, homeless citizens of the United States of America.

We hereby confirm the official request addressed by the Government of the Republic of Iraq to you and the Security Council to make every effort to have this Iraqi humanitarian initiative approved as soon as possible and to notify us in order that we may, in consultation and coordination with the United Nations, set about devising the best means of expediting this humanitarian assistance to poor citizens of the United States of America.

I request you to have this letter circulated to Council members.

(*Signed*) Mohammed Said **Al-Sahaf**
Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq

United Nations A/55/748–S/2001/81

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
25 January 2001

Original: English

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session
Agenda item 164
Measures to eliminate international terrorism

Security Council
Fifty-sixth year

Letter dated 25 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I wish to draw your attention to yet another terrorist murder which occurred this week near the Palestinian-controlled town of Tulkarm.

Shortly after noon Wednesday, 23 January 2001, Motti Dayan and Etgar Zeitouny, co-owners of a popular Tel-Aviv restaurant, set out for the town of Tulkarm in order to purchase items for their business. Reports indicate that Dayan and Zeitouny, accompanied by an Israeli Arab friend, Fuwaz Abu Hussein, stopped for lunch at the Abu Nidal Restaurant on the outskirts of the Palestinian-controlled town. A short time later, Palestinian gunmen arrived and dragged the three out of the restaurant and drove them toward the villages of Iktaba and Bala'a, still within the territory of the Palestinian Authority. The gunmen then executed Dayan and Zeitouny, despite Hussein's supplications that they be spared. The gunmen released Hussein unharmed.

These cold-blooded murders are merely the latest in a series of murders and bombings carried out by Palestinian terrorists. I wish to recall my letter of 23 January 2001 (A/55/742-S/2001/71) which detailed the two recent murders of Ofir Rahum and Ronni Tsalah. These attacks followed a series of bombings in Jerusalem, Tel-Aviv and other locations which killed six Israelis and wounded well over 60 and which were detailed in my letters of 28 December 2000 (A/55/719-S/2000/1252), 22 November 2000 (A/55/641-S/2000/1114), 20 November 2000 (A/55/634-S/2000/1108), and 2 November 2000 (A/55/540-S/2000/1065). Since the outbreak of violence in late September, more than 40 Israelis have been killed and well over a hundred have been injured.

Israel maintains that overall responsibility for this latest attack as well as for the numerous murders and bombings which have occurred in recent months lies with the Palestinian leadership. The official Palestinian media outlets — television, radio, and newspapers — have, throughout this crisis, incited the public to violence by demonizing and dehumanizing Israelis and Jews and glorifying violence and martyrdom. Convicted Palestinian terrorists have been released from Palestinian Authority prisons, an action which sends a green light to those groups to commence

01-22777 (E) 250101

attacks on Israelis. The atmosphere of hatred and rejectionism continues to be nurtured and cultivated within the Palestinian educational system.

All of these actions stand in direct contradiction to the fundamental commitment, made by Palestinian Authority Chairman Yassir Arafat in his letter of 9 September 1993, which formed the bedrock for more than seven years of peacemaking. In the letter, Chairman Arafat committed the Palestinian leadership to peacefully resolving the conflict, renounced the use of violence and terrorism, and resolved to ensure the compliance of all elements and personnel under his authority.

The failure of the Palestinian leadership to abide by this commitment has directly contributed to the outbreak of violence and to the proliferation of terrorist attacks in recent months. A final peace settlement can only be sustained by a fundamental commitment to non-violence, and Israel calls upon the Palestinian leadership to reaffirm its allegiance to that principle.

I should be grateful if you would arrange to have the text of the present letter circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 164, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Yehuda **Lancry**
Permanent Representative

United Nations S/2001/82

Security Council

Distr.: General
25 January 2001
English
Original: French

Letter dated 25 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to inform you that, during its presidency of the Security Council in February 2001, Tunisia intends to organize on 5 February a debate, open to States which are not members of the Council, on the topic "Peace-building: towards a comprehensive approach". This debate will precede the Fourth United Nations/Regional Organizations High-level Meeting which you are organizing on 6 and 7 February 2001, the topic of which is cooperation for peace-building.

Peace-building continues to be the subject of increasingly intense debate within the United Nations. Since the early 1990s, there has been a growing awareness of the close link between conflict prevention and peace-building. It is now commonly acknowledged that in order to build a durable peace, it is essential to adopt an integrated strategy aimed both at tackling the manifold causes of conflicts and at preventing the resumption of a conflict after peace has been achieved. Any conflict-prevention and peace-building action must be designed to last.

The attached note (see annex) could serve as a working paper on the topic of peace-building and suggests certain specific points which could be discussed in greater detail by participants in the debate.

I hope that the debate will permit a fruitful exchange of ideas on the concept of peace-building and further reflection on the close links between conflict prevention, peacekeeping and peace-building, as well as on the interdependence between peace, security and development. The role of regional organizations is particularly important from this standpoint.

I should be grateful if you would have the text of this letter and the attached note distributed as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Said Ben **Mustapha**

01-22802 (E) 260101 260101

Annex to the letter dated 25 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Peace-building: Towards a comprehensive approach

I. Introduction

The issue of peace-building continues to be the subject of increasingly intense debate within the United Nations. Since the early 1990s, there has been a growing awareness of the close link between conflict prevention and peace-building.

Peace-building calls for an integrated strategy comprising a series of actions on various fronts: political, military, diplomatic, economic, social and institutional and other imponderables which together form a coherent social context conducive to the peaceful resolution of conflicts.

Preserving the gains of a peace agreement that has ended a conflict and ensuring the stability of a country require sustained action to address the root causes of the conflict.

The public debate in the Security Council on 5 February 2001 will provide an opportunity for the international community to reaffirm its political will and its commitment to define a common approach to peace-building and to work towards a comprehensive strategy for peace-building and conflict prevention in which the United Nations and regional organizations can play complementary roles.

II. Concept of peace-building

Peace-building is a concept which embodies a range of actions to identify, establish and support structures for strengthening and consolidating peace.

This concept has been the subject of intense debate within the United Nations since the publication of *An Agenda for Peace* (June 1992) and the *Supplement to an Agenda for Peace* (January 1995). Those documents stated, in particular, that the concept of peace-building does not only apply to post-conflict situations but also covers measures which can be taken to prevent a conflict from breaking out in the first place and measures which can be taken during a conflict to facilitate the peace process.

It is also acknowledged that peace-building requires a comprehensive, integrated approach, in that it must give priority to addressing the underlying structural causes of conflict, namely, insufficient or, in some cases, non-existent economic, social and political development. This means that determined, sustained action must be taken to promote development in all its dimensions.

Several reports by the Secretary-General have underlined the importance of conflict prevention and peace-building, among them the 1997 report on "Renewing the United Nations: a programme for reform", the 13 April 1998 report entitled "The causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa" and, more recently, the Millennium report entitled "We the peoples; the role of the United Nations in the twenty-first century".

The report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations (A/55/305-S/2000/809) also looked at the questions raised by post-conflict peace-building.

Given the complexity of the maintenance of international peace and security in its broadest sense, complementarity among the respective roles of all participants must be ensured in preparing and implementing a comprehensive, universally agreed strategy.

Such a strategy calls for positive interaction between the mandates and roles of the various organs of the United Nations, as defined in the Charter, and those of the agencies of the United Nations system. It is essential to maintain and further strengthen the contribution of regional organizations and international financial institutions to this collective endeavour.

The Security Council, meeting at the level of Heads of State and Government in September 2000, pledged "to enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations in addressing conflict at all stages from prevention to settlement to post-conflict peace-building" (resolution 1318 (2000)).

The debates of the Security Council in 1998, 1999 and 2000 on peace-building, conflict prevention and strategies for emerging from conflict situations, and the statements by the President of the Council adopted at the end of those debates, emphasized the importance of a coordinated international approach to eliminating the root causes of armed conflicts and the need for a comprehensive peace-building strategy involving all the actors concerned, including United Nations agencies and programmes, regional and subregional organizations and international financial institutions.

III. Security Council debate

Contributions to the debate planned for February 2001 could focus on the various aspects of peace-building, the problems involved and the role of the United Nations system and other international actors:

A. Peace-building

1. Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants

The success of such a process, whose importance is now universally recognized, depends on adequate, predictable, assured and timely funding. That is the best investment that can be made for peace.

The implementation of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes must be facilitated, inter alia, by giving demobilized former combatants occupational training and by developing income- and employment-generating projects for them. Particular attention should also be paid to the situation of child soldiers (role of the United Nations, its specialized agencies, international financial institutions, multilateral organizations and other partners).

The Council has devoted two public debates to this issue — on 8 July 1999 (see S/PV.4020) and 23 March 2000 (see S/PV.4118) — and two statements by its President (S/PRST/1999/21 and S/PRST/2000/10). At the Council's request, the Secretary-General submitted a report on the issue (S/2000/101 of 11 February 2000). The Security Council has underlined "the necessity of a clear definition of tasks and

division of responsibilities among all actors involved in the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process". In its 23 March 2000 statement (S/PRST/2000/10), the Council recognized that "the mandates of peacekeeping missions increasingly include oversight of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration as one of their functions", this task having proved to be an essential component of peacekeeping.

Combating the illicit traffic in arms is also a very important part of this effort, given the risks which this traffic poses to any peace-building effort.

2. Refugees and displaced persons

Refugees and displaced persons are the primary victims of conflicts and must be the first to benefit from their settlement. Concerted action is needed to prevent:

- Massive, disorganized returns which have destabilizing effects;
- The maintenance of refugee camps beyond the borders of the State concerned, which could become sources of tension;
- The refugee problem having an impact on host countries.

It goes without saying that repatriation and resettlement of refugees and displaced persons are more likely to succeed when carried out in the context of efforts to revive economic activity and repair the social fabric. Otherwise, there is a risk that the problem will simply be transferred and that international assistance will have to continue, and that insecurity and social tensions will develop that could have potentially destabilizing consequences in the future.

3. Poverty eradication and promotion of sustainable development

According to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), many new conflicts are considered to be complex emergencies in development terms. Of the 34 countries which are farthest from achieving the international development goals set at the United Nations conferences held over the past 10 years, 22 are, or were recently, victims of conflict. Of the 27 major conflicts recorded in 1999, 25 were civil wars.

At the Millennium Summit, the Heads of State and Government emphasized the importance of analysing the root causes of conflict. They underscored the close link between peace and development and stressed that poverty and underdevelopment are among the main contributing factors to conflict and that, accordingly, efforts and a commitment by the international community to reduce world poverty and promote sustainable development are a step towards conflict prevention and a contribution to peace-building.

The heads of State and Government resolved to create an environment — at the national and global levels alike — which is conducive to development and to the elimination of poverty.

In its resolution 1318 (2000) adopted on the occasion of the Millennium Summit, the Security Council "strongly encourages the development within the United Nations system and more widely of comprehensive and integrated strategies to address the root causes of conflicts, including their economic and social dimensions".

Blatant inequalities and rising unemployment find fertile ground in poverty and exacerbate the impact of exclusion and marginalization, which are sources of tension and conflict. Eradicating world poverty in the age of globalization is a collective responsibility which calls for increased solidarity and sustained, collective action on the part of the international community, for instance by strengthening existing strategies and mechanisms and developing innovative, flexible, rapid-impact tools to respond to the urgency of certain situations.

4. Strengthening the rule of law and democratic institutions

The establishment of democratic institutions and the promotion of human rights and good governance are two areas of action for preventing conflicts and avoiding their resurgence. Promotion of democratization, establishment of the rule of law, respect for human rights, tolerance, dialogue and reconciliation thus have an important role to play in peace-building and are at the basis of the relationship between peace, security and development.

In fact, there can be no real peace without economic and social development, just as there can be no sustainable development without security and without peace, whether within individual countries, within regions or worldwide.

B. Comprehensive peace-building strategy

Peace-building requires a comprehensive, integrated strategy involving all international partners (United Nations system, international financial institutions, regional and subregional organizations) and the State concerned, taking into account the circumstances specific to each situation.

1. What role can the Security Council play?

Under Article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. To further enhance the effectiveness of its role in this area, the Security Council can act as the international community's catalyst for increasing interest in, and securing a resolute commitment to, genuinely meeting the demands of peace-building, particularly post-conflict peace-building.

In recent years, the Security Council has included peace-building components in the mandates of peacekeeping operations. This is true of the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic (MINURCA) in the Central African Republic, the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC) in Cambodia, the United Nations Transitional Administration for Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and Western Sirmium (UNTAES) in Croatia, the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) in Kosovo and the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) in East Timor. Offices or missions in support of peace-building programmes have also taken over from peacekeeping missions (in Liberia, the Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti and Tajikistan).

As soon as preparations for a peacekeeping operation begin, consultations should be held among the principal organs concerned with a view to devising a peace-building strategy and mobilizing the necessary resources.

Such consultations between the Security Council and all the bodies involved in peace-building, as well as the coordinating role to be played by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, should, while respecting mandates and spheres of competence, aim to develop peace-building strategies which will:

- Specify the responsibilities of each participant;
- Ensure close coordination among all actors;
- Establish a timetable for the implementation of programmes;
- Ensure, to the extent possible, the availability of funding, particularly funding based on voluntary contributions;
- Incorporate the necessary peace-building components in the peacekeeping operation and ensure, within a reasonable period of time, the smoothest possible transition between the peacekeeping and peace-building phases.

2. What role can other actors play?

There are several actors concerned with peace-building. Since their priorities differ, greater coordination and consultation are needed in order to design a comprehensive, integrated peace-building strategy. If it is to succeed, such a strategy will require:

- Sustained, determined political will;
- Mobilization of the necessary resources.

Action by the international community must translate rapidly into tangible improvements in the daily lives of populations emerging from a conflict.

The international community's active support for peace-building efforts is essential for maintaining the momentum of peace activities. It would therefore be useful to look at ways of mobilizing more effectively the political will and the resources necessary for peace-building. How can the United Nations system, donors and regional organizations cooperate towards this end?

United Nations S/2001/83

Security Council

Distr.: General
25 January 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 25 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Portugal to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

On the occasion of the Security Council open debate on the mandate of the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET), I would like to give a brief overview of the support my country has until now extended to UNTAET and to the transition of East Timor to independence.

In the months following the post-ballot violence, Portugal made substantial contributions to the consolidated humanitarian appeal for East Timor, including contributions to the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), as a way to help the repatriation and resettlement of refugees and internally displaced people.

Portugal currently has about 800 men in the military component of UNTAET. In an effort to respond to UNTAET's requests for enhancing the force, this number will be increased, as of February 2001, raising our national contingent to a total of around 1,000 men. We also have a police contingent of 165 police officers, including 120 elements of the Rapid Reaction Unit stationed in Dili.

We are participating actively in UNTAET's plans to establish an East Timorese Defense Force, which is considered fundamental to ensure the sovereign right to security of the future independent state. Portugal, which is working alongside other interested countries, has committed 2.3 million United States dollars for this year alone for this purpose. Areas of activity include conducting the selection process of the new recruits, providing training and equipment for the first 600 elements of the new force, and training its naval component, which includes the provision of two patrol launches.

As part of our commitment to establish a sound and sustainable East Timorese administration, we have made a total contribution of $8.4 million for the UNTAET Trust Fund. Other contributions in this area include the provision, at the request of UNTAET, of specialized services and personnel as well as the refurbishment of public buildings, such as the establishment of mail services, the provision of personnel for the justice and border control sectors, and the renovation of the Dili District Court. We have also trained Timorese staff in fire-fighting and support to civilian population in case of disasters. That staff now integrates the Department of Police and Emergency Services of the East Timorese Transitional Administration.

01-22790 (E) 250101

Portugal is also currently finalizing negotiations with UNTAET to provide assistance in the civil aviation sector, by managing the Comoro Airport, in Dili.

Portugal has committed $50 million, to be disbursed over a four-year period (2000-2003), for the World Bank-administered Trust Fund for East Timor. By the end of this year $15 million will have been disbursed, for areas such as infrastructure, health and education. Our efforts in the area of education are very strongly complemented by our bilateral engagement in that sector, which amounts already to $6.8 million. Actions include support to the restructuring of the educational system, training of teachers, support to the production of educational materials and granting of scholarships for Timorese students, both in East Timor and abroad.

Through the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Portugal is carrying out projects in the area of sanitation, a much-needed area with a fundamental impact on health conditions. This is being carried out in Baucau, the second largest city in East Timor. We are also working with UNDP and UNTAET in the area of public administration.

Portugal supported the first training course for diplomats, organized and coordinated by UNTAET, which took place in Dili last August. As a follow-up to that support, we are providing further training for groups of new diplomats at our Ministry for Foreign Affairs in Lisbon. This, we believe, to be a very important area, since the new country will need skilled personnel to carry out what its leaders have already established as a priority — the development of foreign relations, especially with the countries in the region.

I will not go through the extensive list of Portugal's bilateral aid to East Timor, since that has been raised in other forums. I will highlight, however, the principles on which it is based: it is complementary to the work of UNTAET, United Nations agencies and the international financial institutions; it seeks the participation of the East Timorese and tries to promote their ownership of the transition process.

Portugal's views on the extension of the mandate of UNTAET and the United Nations presence in East Timor after independence will be expressed tomorrow in the statement of the European Union in the open debate, with which we fully concur.

(*Signed*) António **Monteiro**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

United Nations S/2001/84

Security Council

Distr.: General
25 January 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 25 January 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Uganda to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

On instructions of my Government and in reference to Security Council document S/2001/49 of 16 January 2001, I have the honour to forward to you comments by the Government of Uganda on the interim report of the United Nations Expert Panel on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would bring these comments to the attention of the members of the Security Council and circulate the same as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Fred **Beyendeza**
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

01-22796 (E) 260101

Annex to the letter dated 25 January 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Uganda to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

Comments by Uganda on the interim report of the United Nations Expert Panel on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo dated 16 January 2001

1. Uganda wishes to thank the United Nations Expert Panel and to welcome the release by the Secretary-General of the interim report on the Illegal Exploitation of the Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo on 16 January 2001 (S/2001/49). It clearly shows the desire of the Secretary-General to fulfil the request by the President of the Security Council contained in his letter dated 2 June 2000 (S/PRST/2000/20). It also demonstrates the commitment of the Secretary-General to the pursuit of peace and stability in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The Panel's interpretation of its mandate (Section II.A, paras. 5 and 6)

2. The Security Council mandate for the United Nations Panel was to: (a) follow up reports, collect information on all activities of illegal exploitation of natural resources and other forms of wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and (b) research and analyse the links between the exploitation of the natural resources and other forms of wealth in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the continuation of the conflict. The United Nations Panel interpreted the above mandate to mean that the parties to the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo are there to exploit, control and profit from the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and that part of the proceeds from these resources are utilized to finance and sustain the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

3. The view of Uganda is that this interpretation has no bearing whatsoever with the said mandate. The interpretation is totally outside the ordinary meaning of the words in the mandate. The mandate simply states that the Panel should follow up reports, collect information on all activities of illegal exploitation of natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and analyse the data to ascertain whether there is a link between the exploitation of the said resources and the continuation of the conflict.

4. It is apparent from the interpretation of its mandate that the United Nations Expert Panel put the cart before the horse. Before commencement of execution of its mandate the Panel assumed that the conflict was motivated by the desire to exploit the resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Nothing could be far from the truth. Uganda has persistently stated that it is in the Democratic Republic of the Congo because of its own security concerns. Uganda's security concerns have been recognized and endorsed by the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Mr. She Okitundu, the Congolese Minister for Foreign Affairs, stated in the Security Council in December 2000 that his Government recognizes that Uganda's presence in the

Democratic Republic of the Congo was motivated by its security concerns (see S/PV.4247).

Report on Uganda
(Section C, paras 30 to 37)

5. The interim report fairly summarizes the discussions the Panel had with President Museveni, members of Cabinet, Government officials and members of the Parliamentary Committee on Presidential and Foreign Affairs at their meeting in Kampala, from 7 to 12 November 2000.

6. The report on Uganda, however, leaves out a vital component of the mandate of the Panel, namely, data collection and analysis. At the first meeting of the United Nations Expert Panel in Kampala on 7 November 2000, the Government of Uganda was given a detailed questionnaire by the Chairperson, Mme Ba- N'Daw. The detailed response of the Government to the questionnaire was sent to the United Nations Resident Coordinator on 21 November 2000. The analysis of the 1994/1995-2000 statistical and economic data and interviews with Ugandan officials clearly indicate that there has not been any significant increases in Uganda's imports/exports in the mineral and agricultural products of interest to the Democratic Republic of the Congo since 1998. It is significant to note that Uganda's national accounts are among the most reliable in Africa. Besides the long tradition of national data collection, Uganda's data is highly respected by international financial institutions, including the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. Data kept by, inter alia, the Uganda Revenue Authority, the Bank of Uganda, the Ministry of Finance and the Uganda Bureau of Standards have been computerized since 1996.

7. The interim report fails to mention the high degree of cooperation and openness the Panel received from the Ugandan authorities. The generalization of the report that the Panel received varying levels of cooperation from its interlocutors ranging from "apparent openness to near hostility" is, therefore, grossly unfair.

8. It does not reflect the key message from President Museveni and First Deputy Prime Minister/Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. E. Kategaya concerning the allegation of illegal exploitation of natural resources in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which expressed their sense that the exercise is a red-herring and a diversion from the real problem in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The real task is to bring about stability and create a democratic state in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, as envisaged in the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement of July 1999.

Allegations by the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo
(Paras. 19 to 23)

9. The report lists allegations by the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo against Uganda, claiming that Uganda has been involved in the exploitation of minerals (gold, diamonds), agricultural products (coffee, livestock) and protected species (elephants, gorillas, okapis). The analysis of the economic/statistical data on Uganda clearly indicates that there have been no significant increase in our exports/imports of these products. The information given to the United Nations Panel also demonstrates Uganda's strict adherence to the international conventions on the control of trade in endangered species.

10. The United Nations Panel quotes officials of the Democratic Republic of the Congo making an erroneous connection between the regrettable incidents between Ugandan and Rwandese troops in Kisangani and the control of mineral resources in eastern Congo. The unfortunate clashes were not about the struggle for minerals as economic data demonstrates. It is, therefore, a diversion to link the Kisangani incidents and the alleged exploitation of natural resources in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

11. The report highlights the mistaken belief in Kinshasa that Uganda could not finance its involvement in the Democratic Republic of the Congo without the active exploitation of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. This is a figment of the imagination of the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which does not provide any evidence to the Panel. In paragraphs 12 and 23 of the report the Panel complains that the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo has not been able to give them evidence of the allegations.

12. It should be recalled that the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo filed a case against Uganda with the International Court of Justice on 23 June 1999. The application was followed by a detailed memorial alleging, inter alia, illegal exploitation of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Democratic Republic of the Congo did not file any evidence about these allegations with the court. Uganda has consistently stated that it is in the Democratic Republic of the Congo because of its security concerns. Uganda has prepared a detailed counter memorial detailing numerous incidents of attacks from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo causing hundreds of thousands deaths and injuries; destruction of property and the negative impact on the economy. All of the above justify Uganda's expenditure to maintain its presence in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to pre-empt these attacks/raids on Uganda from its territory. The summary report on the United Nations Panel's visit to Uganda in annex II of the interim report clearly shows Uganda's expenditures for the maintenance of troops in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to neutralize further attacks. Uganda has been able to keep her defence expenditure under 2 per cent of GDP as per its commitment with the donor community.

The next steps

13. In our view Uganda has already provided adequate detailed information to the United Nations Panel. Uganda will, however, continue to cooperate fully with the United Nations Panel, and strongly urges other relevant parties to do likewise. In our view, for the United Nations Panel to produce a fair and balanced final report it should, inter alia:

(a) Establish a factual picture of the natural resource base of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and documentary evidence to back the allegations of the exploitation of natural resources rather than accusations built purely on rumour and anecdotal literature;

(b) Obtain and analyse detailed statistical and economic data on, for example, the oil and minerals etc. imports/exports of all the countries involved in the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, without exception;

(c) Put more emphasis on generating relevant data and information in capitals of the industrialized countries, such as France and Belgium, with traditional

links with the Democratic Republic of the Congo, including individuals and companies with capacity to invest in mining operations and maintaining non-gazetted airfields from which mineral products and other natural resources are airlifted to markets outside Africa.

14. During the visit to Uganda by the United Nations Expert Group, from 7 to 12 November 2000, time was wasted because of inadequate advance preparedness by the Panel. The detailed questionnaires were, for example, provided after the team's arrival in Kampala and yet the various government institutions needed at least three to seven days to prepare/generate the required information. It is, therefore, important that in their future work the Panel should provide, two to three weeks in advance, specific allegations and evidence etc. against each country's government, private companies and individuals. This method of work will not only be more efficient, but will also ensure fair play and avoid the element of surprise.

15. Finally, it is important to reiterate that Uganda got involved in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in order to protect her legitimate national security interests against the Sudanese-backed rebels and their allied genocidaires in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Uganda is also fully committed to the withdrawal of the Uganda People's Defence Force (UPDF) from the Democratic Republic of the Congo in accordance with the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement (July 1999), the Kampala disengagement plan (April 2000) and Security Council resolution 1304 (2000). It is in Uganda's best interest that we have a stable, democratic, united, friendly and prosperous Democratic Republic of the Congo in the Great Lakes Region.

United Nations S/2001/85

Security Council

Distr.: General
26 January 2001
English
Original: Arabic

Letter dated 24 January 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a letter dated 23 January 2001 from Mr. Mohammed Said Al-Sahaf, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq. Appended to the Minister's letter are a number of tables showing violations of Iraq's international boundaries committed by United States and British warplanes flying across the demilitarized zone monitored by the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM).

The Minister urges you to secure the necessary technical systems to enable UNIKOM to perform its functions in the manner required by its mandate under the relevant Security Council resolutions and to track and identify each violation and encroachment. These violations constitute wanton aggression against Iraq and against its people, its sovereignty and its territory, and they are incompatible with the relevant Security Council resolutions, the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international law.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Mohammed **Al-Humaimidi**
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

01-22912 (E) 290101 290101

Annex to the letter dated 24 January 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Further to my letter dated 25 December 2000 addressed to you (S/2000/1242, annex), I should like to inform you that United States and British warplanes have committed 7,824 violations of Iraq's international boundaries by way of the demilitarized zone monitored by the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM). As shown in the tables appended to this letter, the relevant Iraqi authorities have established the facts set forth hereunder with regard to the violations committed in the period from 17 December 1998 to 31 December 2000.

1. Armed and hostile aerial activity by the United States and the United Kingdom, violating our international boundaries from the demilitarized zone, comprised 7,824 sorties over Iraq's southern governorates (Basrah, Amarah, Nasiriyah, Diwaniyah, Samawah, Najaf and Wasit).

2. Our technical systems identified the aircraft violating Iraq's airspace on an almost daily basis as American F-14s, F-15s, F-16s and F-18s and British Tornadoes.

3. All of the armed and hostile sorties that violated Iraq's airspace from the demilitarized zone were supported by AWACS aircraft operating inside Saudi Arabian airspace and E-2C aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace.

4. A total of 12 remotely piloted aircraft violated Iraq's airspace from Kuwait by way of the demilitarized zone.

5. On 17, 18, 19 and 20 December 2000, United States and British forces launched 456 cruise missiles against Iraqi territory across the demilitarized zone.

All of the violations in question were committed from the area in which UNIKOM is stationed. UNIKOM has the responsibility of monitoring such hostile military operations and reporting them immediately or, at the very least, including information in their regard in the periodic reports that it submits to you and thence to the Security Council for purposes of documentation. The members of the Council and the international community in general may thus be informed of such violations and military encroachments committed by the United States and the United Kingdom and act to take appropriate measures to halt them.

The statements of UNIKOM to the effect that it is unable to monitor or identify these aircraft cannot be maintained in the light of the scientific and technological capabilities available, and UNIKOM is in a position to obtain and utilize them to fulfil the requirements of its mandate by establishing the identity and country of the warplanes that are violating Iraq's airspace.

I accordingly urge you to secure the systems that will allow UNIKOM to perform its functions in the manner required by its mandate under the relevant Security Council resolutions by identifying each violation and encroachment. These

violations constitute wanton aggression against Iraq and against its people, its sovereignty and its territory, and they are incompatible with the relevant Security Council resolutions, the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international law.

(*Signed*) Mohammed Said **Al-Sahaf**
Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq

Appendix

Hostile aerial activity violating Iraq's international boundaries from Kuwait across the demilitarized zone, 17-31 December 1998

Date	Area	Time	Type	Sorties	Altitude (metres)	Speed (km/h)	Areas overflown
17-31 December 1998	Demilitarized zone, from the direction of Kuwait	2405-2350	F-14, F-15, F-16, F-18, Tornado	129	7,000-9,000	720-780	Baghdad, Salah al-Din, Ta'mim, Wasit, Muthanna, Nasiriyah, Amarah

Total sorties: 129

Hostile aerial activity violating Iraq's international boundaries from Kuwait by way of the demilitarized zone, 1999

No.	Month	Area	Time	Type	Sorties	Altitude (metres)	Speed (km/h)	Areas overflown
1	January	Demilitarized zone, from the direction of Kuwait	0630-1220	F-14, F-15, F-16, F-18, Tornado	456	9,000-11,000	720-780	Umm Qasr, Artawi, Basrah, Nasiriyah, Jalibah, Amarah, Diwaniyah, Samawah, Busayyah
2	February	"	0700-1500	"	408	10,000-12,000	"	Jalibah, Artawi, Umm Qasr, Qurnah, Shatrah, Rifa'i, Diwaniyah, Samawah
3	March	"	1100-1305	"	276	9,000-12,000	"	Umm Qasr, Samawah, Shatrah, Artawi, Ali al-Gharbi, Diwaniyah, Qurnah, Nasiriyah
4	April	"	0705-1010	"	243	10,000-12,000	"	Basrah, Nasiriyah, Rifa'i, Hayy, Diwaniyah, Busayyah, Samawah, Artawi
5	May	"	1000-1200	"	490	9,000-12,000	"	Basrah, Nasiriyah, Samawah, Busayyah, Jalibah, Ali al-Gharbi, Artawi
6	June	"	0740-1350	"	778	10,000-12,000	"	Umm Qasr, Basrah, Qurnah, Nasiriyah, Samawah, Diwaniyah, Jalibah
7	July	"	0900-1420	"	311	10,000-12,000	"	Basrah, Nasiriyah, Shatrah, Rifa'i, Jalibah, Busayyah
8	August	"	0820-1530	"	290	10,000-12,000	"	Umm Qasr, Artawi, Jalibah, Nasiriyah, Samawah, Shatrah, Basrah, Ali al-Gharbi
9	September	"	1010-1200	"	268	10,000-12,000	"	Artawi, Jalibah, Basrah, Samawah, Ali al-Gharbi, Najaf, Diwaniyah, Nasiriyah, Busayyah
10	October	"	0805-1310	"	358	10,000-12,000	"	Qurnah, Basrah, Artawi, Shatrah, Diwaniyah, Samawah, Busayyah
11	November	"	0735-1020	"	401	9,000-12,000	"	Umm Qasr, Basrah, Diwaniyah, Amarah, Diwaniyah, Busayyah, Samawah, Jalibah
12	December	"	1100-1405	"	472	9,000-12,000	"	Umm Qasr, Basrah, Nasiriyah, Diwaniyah, Amarah, Samawah, Jalibah, Shatrah, Ali al-Gharbi, Busayyah

Total sorties: 4,751

Hostile aerial activity violating Iraq's international boundaries from Kuwait by way of the demilitarized zone, 2000

No.	Month	Area	Time	Type	Sorties	Altitude (metres)	Speed (km/h)	Areas overflown
1	January	Demilitarized zone, from the direction of Kuwait	1100-1600	F-14, F-15, F-16, F-18, Tornado	420	9,000-11,000	720-780	Artawi, Nasiriyah, Jalibah, Amarah, Diwaniyah, Samawah, Busayyah, Shatrah, Rifa'i
2	February	"	0905-1350	"	230	10,000-12,000	"	Umm Qasr, Basrah, Amarah, Nasiriyah, Samawah, Artawi, Busayyah, Rifa'i, Jalibah
3	March	"	0735-1800	"	248	10,000-12,000	"	Basrah, Amarah, Nasiriyah, Shatrah, Jalibah, Busayyah, Samawah, Rifa'i
4	April	"	0630-1600	"	201	10,000-12,000	"	Umm Qasr, Basrah, Jalibah, Nasiriyah, Shatrah, Rifa'i, Amarah, Busayyah, Samawah
5	May	"	0845-1335	"	194	10,000-12,000	"	Basrah, Nasiriyah, Umm Qasr, Amarah, Busayyah, Jalibah, Rifa'i, Diwaniyah
6	June	"	0700-1440	"	132	10,000-11,000	"	Basrah, Nasiriyah, Samawah, Diwaniyah, Amarah, Jalibah, Artawi, Busayyah
7	July	"	0705-1850	"	214	10,000-12,000	"	Artawi, Busayyah, Jalibah, Diwaniyah, Amarah, Shatrah, Ali al Gharbi, Samawah
8	August	"	0710-1600	"	200	10,000-12,000	"	Jalibah, Artawi, Qurnah, Shatrah, Nasiriyah, Busayyah, Diwaniyah, Samawah, Umm Qasr
9	September	"	0700-1900	"	248	10,000-12,000	"	Umm Qasr, Qurnah, Basrah, Artawi, Diwaniyah, Samawah, Nasiriyah, Rifa'i, Qurnah
10	October	"	0822-1835	"	340	9,000-12,000	"	Busayyah, Diwaniyah, Najaf South, Nasiriyah, Rifa'i, Shatrah, Diwaniyah, Samawah
11	November	"	0900-1430	"	232	10,000-12,000	"	Basrah, Umm Qasr, Jalibah, Rifa'i, Shatrah, Samawah, Diwaniyah, Qurnah, Busayyah
12	December	"	0800-1435	"	285	10,000-12,000	"	Umm Qasr, Artawi, Basrah, Jalibah, Bussayah, Diwaniyah, Nasiriyah, Qurnah, Shatrah

Total sorties: 2,944

Violations from the demilitarized zone of remotely piloted aircraft coming from the direction of Kuwait, 1999-2000

No.	Date	Time	Number	Speed (km/h)	Altitude (metres)	From	Areas overflown
1	25 October 1999	1935-0345	1	240	7,000	Kuwait	Busayyah, Nasiriyah, Shatrah, Rifa'i, Ali al-Gharbi, Hayy, Diwaniyah, Samawah
2	4 November 1999	1015-1045	1	480	9,000	"	Busayyah
3	7 January 2000	0847-1005	1	360	8,000	"	Busayyah
4	21 January 2000	2025-2100	1	240	7,000	"	Nasiriyah, Shatrah, Rifa'i
5	20 June 2000	0222-0325	1	360	7,000	"	Busayyah, Jalibah
6	20 June 2000	0222-0325	1	360	8,000	"	Busayyah, Jalibah
7	18 December 2000	0920-1102	1	240	7,000	"	Umm Qasr, Artawi, Jalibah, Busayyah
8	19 December 2000	1041-1132	1	240	7,000	"	Umm Qasr
9	21 December 2000	1022-1120	1	180	8,000	"	Umm Qasr Basrah
10	21 December 2000	1134-1419	1	240	7,000	"	Umm Qasr, Basrah
11	31 December 2000	1248-1505	1	240	7,000	"	Basrah
12	31 December 2000	1632-1730	1	240	7,000	"	Basrah

Total sorties: 12

United Nations S/2001/86

Security Council

Distr.: General
29 January 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 27 January 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Yugoslavia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to transmit a letter dated 27 January 2001 from H.E. Mr. Goran Svilanovic, Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, addressed to you, concerning the latest atrocity committed by ethnic Albanian terrorists in southern Serbia and in this regard the request of the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia for an urgent meeting of the Security Council (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Vladislav **Mladenovic**
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

Annex to the letter dated 27 January 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Yugoslavia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has repeatedly warned the Security Council and other major international bodies of the serious implications for peace and security in the South of Serbia caused by the incursions of armed Albanian extremists and terrorists from Kosovo and Metohija in the Ground Safety Zone (GSZ). Ever since, these armed groups have constantly endangered security, resulting in many serious incidents, particularly over the past few days.

On 26 January 2001, early in the morning, Albanian terrorists attacked an army unit moving along the Bujanovac-Presevo road with rocket-propelled grenades, heavy machine-guns and sniper fire in the vicinity of the village of Gomja Susaja, near Bujanovac, outside the GSZ. Dragan Dimitrijevic, a soldier, was seriously wounded in the attack and soon succumbed to wounds.

It is obvious that these activities of the Albanian terrorists are primarily aimed not only at endangering security and sowing terror among the civilians in the municipalities of Sujanovac, Presevo and Meduadja in southern Serbia, but also at provoking the Yugoslav police and army.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is ready to protect fully its sovereignty and territorial integrity and is firmly committed to persistently seeking a peaceful, diplomatic solution to this serious problem in accordance with Security Council resolution 1244 (1999) and the Military-Technical Agreement. In the wake of the latest incident and worsening of security situation, we demand that an urgent meeting of the Security Council be called to condemn this crime in the strongest terms in order that measures be undertaken to find the perpetrators and bring them to justice without delay.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia also requests the Council to ensure that the provisions contained in its statement of 19 December 2000 be fully implemented, in particular that the Albanian terrorists withdraw immediately from the Zone and be disbanded, and that the regime established in the Zone, be fully respected. To that end, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia stands ready to cooperate fully with the international community.

(*Signed*) Goran **Svilanovic**

United Nations S/2001/87

Security Council

Distr.: General
29 January 2001
English
Original: French

Draft resolution

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) of 19 March 1978, 501 (1982) of 25 February 1982, 508 (1982) of 5 June 1982, 509 (1982) of 6 June 1982, 520 (1982) of 17 September 1982 and 1310 (2000) of 27 July 2000, as well as its resolutions and the statements of its President on the situation in Lebanon,

Recalling further its resolution 1308 (2000) of 17 July 2000,

Recalling also the Secretary-General's conclusion that, as of 16 June 2000, Israel had withdrawn its forces from Lebanon in accordance with resolution 425 (1978) and met the requirements defined in the Secretary-General's report of 22 May 2000 (S/2000/460),

Emphasizing the interim nature of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL),

Recalling the relevant principles contained in the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel adopted on 9 December 1994,

Responding to the request of the Government of Lebanon as stated in the letter from its Permanent Representative to the United Nations of 5 January 2001 to the Secretary-General (S/2001/14),

1. *Welcomes* the report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL of 22 January 2001 (S/2001/66), and *endorses* his observations and recommendations;

2. *Decides* to extend the present mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months, until 31 July 2001;

3. *Decides* to return the military personnel of UNIFIL to the operational level referred to in paragraph 24 of the Secretary-General's report of 22 January 2001 by 31 July, and *requests* that the Secretary-General take the necessary measures to implement this decision, including taking into account the upcoming rotations of the battalions, in consultation with the Government of Lebanon and the troop-contributing countries;

4. *Reiterates* its strong support for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries;

5. *Calls* on the Government of Lebanon to ensure the return of its effective authority and presence in the south, and in particular to increase the rate of the deployment of the Lebanese armed forces;

6. *Welcomes* the establishment of checkpoints by the Government of Lebanon in the vacated area, and *encourages* the Government of Lebanon to ensure a calm environment throughout the south, including through the control of all checkpoints;

7. *Calls* on the parties to fulfil the commitments they have given to respect fully the withdrawal line identified by the United Nations, as set out in the Secretary-General's report of 16 June 2000 (S/2000/590), to exercise utmost restraint and to cooperate fully with the United Nations and with UNIFIL;

8. *Condemns* all acts of violence, *expresses* concern about the serious breaches and violations of the withdrawal line, and *urges* the parties to put an end to them and to respect the safety of UNIFIL personnel;

9. *Commends* UNIFIL for having fulfilled its mandate regarding verification of Israeli withdrawal, and *supports* its continued efforts to maintain the ceasefire along the withdrawal line through patrols and observation from fixed positions and close contacts with the parties, with a view to correcting violations and preventing the escalation of incidents;

10. *Welcomes* the contribution of UNIFIL to operational demining, *encourages* further assistance in mine action by the United Nations to the Government of Lebanon in support of both the continued development of its national mine action capacity and emergency demining activities in the south, and *calls* on donor countries to support these efforts through financial and in-kind contributions;

11. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue consultations with the Government of Lebanon and other parties directly concerned on the implementation of this resolution and to report to the Security Council thereon;

12. *Looks forward* to the early fulfilment of the mandate of UNIFIL;

13. *Endorses* the general approach for reconfiguration of UNIFIL, as outlined in paragraph 23 of the report of the Secretary-General of 22 January 2001, and *requests* the Secretary-General to submit to the Council a detailed report by 30 April 2001 on UNIFIL reconfiguration plans and on the tasks that could be carried out by the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO);

14. *Decides* to review the situation by early May 2001 and to consider any steps it deems appropriate regarding UNIFIL and UNTSO, on the basis of this report;

15. *Stresses* the importance of, and the need to achieve, a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East, based on all its relevant resolutions including its resolutions 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 and 338 (1973) of 22 October 1973.

United Nations S/2001/88

Security Council

Distr.: General
29 January 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 25 January 2001 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to refer to your letter dated 16 January 2001 to me (S/2001/48) concurring with my proposal to appoint Mr. Mohamed El Habib Fassi Fihri as a permanent judge of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia Since 1991. I have now received a corresponding letter from the President of the General Assembly. Accordingly, I have appointed Mr. Fassi Fihri as a permanent judge of the International Tribunal, effective 1 March 2001, for the remainder of the term of office of Judge Bennouna, which term will expire on 16 November 2001.

(*Signed*) Kofi A. **Annan**

01-23075 (E) 290101